arXiv:1701.05532v1 [math.CO] 19 Jan 2017

Tighter Bounds for the Discrepancy of Boxes and Polytopes

Aleksandar Nikolov
Department of Computer Science
University of Toronto
anikolov@cs.toronto.edu

Abstract

Combinatorial discrepancy is a complexity measure of a collection of sets which quantifies how well the sets in the collection can be simultaneously balanced. More precisely, we are given an n-point set P, and a collection $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, ..., F_m\}$ of subsets of P, and our goal is color P with two colors, red and blue, so that the largest absolute difference between the number of red elements and the number of blue elements (i.e. the discrepancy) in any F_i is minimized. Combinatorial discrepancy has many applications in mathematics and computer science, including constructions of uniformly distributed point sets, and lower bounds for data structures and private data analysis algorithms.

We investigate the combinatorial discrepancy of geometrically defined set systems, in which P is an n-point set in d-dimensional space, and $\mathcal{F}$ is the collection of subsets of P induced by dilations and translations of a fixed convex polytope B. Such set systems include sets induced by axis-aligned boxes, whose discrepancy is the subject of the well known Tusnády problem. We prove new discrepancy upper bounds for such set systems by extending the approach based on factorization norms previously used by the author and Matoušek. We improve the best known upper bound for the Tusnády problem by a logarithmic factor, using a result of Banaszczyk on signed series of vectors. We extend this improvement to any arbitrary convex polytope B by using a decomposition due to Matoušek.

1 Introduction

As usual, we define the combinatorial discrepancy of a system $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of some finite set P as:

$$\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{F} := \min_{\chi\colon P \to \{-1,1\}} \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{p \in F} \chi(p).$$

We refer the reader to the book of Matoušek [Ms10] for background on combinatorial discrepancy. For a reference to the large number of applications of

combinatorial discrepancy to geometric discrepancy, numerical methods, and computer science, see the book of Chazelle [Cha00]. A recent application to private data analysis can be found in the thesis of the author [Nik14].

Let $\mathcal{A}_d$ be the family of *anchored* axis-aligned boxes in $\mathbb{R}^d$: $\mathcal{A}_d := \{A(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, where $A(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_i \le x_i \ \forall i \in [d]\}$ and $[d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$. This is a slight abuse of terminology: $A(x)$ is not a box, but rather a polyhedral cone. Usually $A(x)$ is defined to be anchored at 0, i.e. it is defined as the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \le y_i \le x_i \ \forall i \in [d]\}$. However, we prefer to anchor $A(x)$ at $(-\infty, -\infty)$. This convention does not affect any of the results in the paper, and allows us to avoid some minor technicalities.

For an n-point set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_d(P) := \{A(x) \cap P : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ the set system induced by anchored boxes on P. (Note that this set system is finite, and, in fact, can have at most n^d sets.) Tusnády's problem asks for tight bounds on the largest possible combinatorial discrepancy of $\mathcal{A}_d(P)$ over all n-point sets P. Here we prove the following theorem, which gives a new *upper bound* on the discrepancy.

Theorem 1. *For any $d \ge 2$, there exists a constant C_d s.t. for any n-point set P in $\mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{A}_d(P) \le C_d (1 + \log n)^{d-1/2}.$$

It was shown in [MN15, MNT14] that for infinitely many n there exists an n-point set P such that $\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{A}_d(P) = \Omega_d(\log n^{d-1})$, so the upper bound above is within a $O_d(\sqrt{\log n})$ factor from the lower bound. (Here, and in the rest of this paper, we use the notation $O_p(\cdot), \Omega_p(\cdot), \Theta_p(\cdot)$ to denote the fact that the implicit constant in the asymptotic notation depends on the parameter p.) The best previously known upper bound for the Tusnády problem was $O_d(\log^d n)$, and was recently proved by Bansal and Garg [BG16]. Their result improved on the prior work of Larsen [Lar14] (see also the proof in [MNT14]), who showed an upper bound of $O_d(\log^{d+1/2} n)$.

More generally, let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and, for an n-point set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathcal{F}(P)$ be the set system induced by $\mathcal{F}$ on P, i.e. $\mathcal{F}(P) := \{F \cap P : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We are interested in how the worst-case combinatorial discrepancy of such set systems grows with n. This is captured by the function $\operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{F}) := \sup\{\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{F}(P) : P \subset \mathbb{R}^d, |P| = n\}$. In this notation, Theorem 1 shows that $\operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{A}_d) = O_d(\log^{d-1/2} n)$.

Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and let's define $\mathcal{T}_K$ to be the family of images of K under translations and homothetic transformations: $\mathcal{T}_K := \{tK + x : t \in \mathbb{R}_+, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, where $\mathbb{R}_+$ is the set of positive reals. If we take $Q := [0,1]^d$, then it's well-known that $\operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{T}_Q) \le 2^d \operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{A}_d)$ and, therefore, Theorem 1 implies $\operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{T}_Q) = O_d(\log^{d-1/2} n)$. Our next result shows that this bound holds for any polytope B in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 2. *For any $d \ge 2$, and any closed convex polytope $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\operatorname{disc}(n, \mathcal{T}_B) = O_{d,B}(\log^{d-1/2} n).$$

We note that with the same proof we can establish the stronger fact that $\mathrm{disc}(n, \mathrm{POL}(\mathcal{H})) = O_{d,\mathcal{H}}(\log^{d-1/2} n)$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a family of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathrm{POL}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of all polytopes which can be written as $\bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_i$, with each γ_i a halfspace whose boundary is parallel to some $h \in \mathcal{H}$. The best previously known upper bound in this setting is also due to Bansal and Garg [BG16], and is equal to $O_{d,B}(\log^d n)$.

Our approach builds on the connection between the γ_2 norm and hereditary discrepancy shown in [NT15, MNT14]. The new idea which enables the tighter bounds is to use a result of Banaszczyk, proved in the context of improving the constants in the Steinitz lemma, in order to get one dimension "for free". The proof of Theorem 2 combines the ideas in the proof of Theorem 1 with a decomposition due to Matoušek [Mat99].

1.1 Connection to Geometric Discrepancy

Geometric discrepancy measures the irregularity of a distribution of n points in $[0,1]^d$ with respect to a family of distinguishing sets. In particular, for an n-point set $P \subseteq [0,1]^d$ and a family of measurable subsets $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we define the discrepancy

$$D(P, \mathcal{F}) := \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \left| |P \cap F| - \lambda_d(F \cap [0,1]^d) \right|,$$

where λ_d is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The smallest achievable discrepancy over n point sets with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ is denoted $D(n, \mathcal{F}) := \inf\{D(P, \mathcal{F}) : P \subset \mathbb{R}^d, |P| = n\}$. A famous result of Schmidt [Sch72] shows that $D(n, \mathcal{A}_2) = \Theta(\log n)$. The picture is much less clear in higher dimensions. In a seminal paper [Rot54], Roth showed that $D(n, \mathcal{A}_d) = \Omega_d(\log^{(d-1)/2} n)$ for any $d \geq 2$; the best known lower bound in $d \geq 3$ us due to Bilyk, Lacey, and Vagharshakyan [BLV08] and is $D(n, \mathcal{A}_d) = \Omega_d(\log^{(d-1)/2+\eta_d} n)$, where η_d is a positive constant depending on d and going to 0 as d goes to infinity. On the other hand, the best known upper bound is $D(n, \mathcal{A}_d) = O_d(\log^{d-1} n)$ and can be achieved in many different ways, one of the simplest being the Halton-Hammersley construction [Hal60, Ham60]. The book by Beck and Chen [BC08] calls the problem of closing this significant gap "the Great Open Problem" (in geometric discrepancy theory). See the book of Matoušek [Ms10] for further background on geometric discrepancy.

There is a known connection between combinatorial and geometric discrepancy. Roughly speaking, combinatorial discrepancy is an upper bound on geometric discrepancy. More precisely, we have the following transference lemma, which goes back to the work of Beck on Tusnády's problem [Bec81] (see [Ms10] for a proof).

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of measurable sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that there is some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ which contains $[0,1]^d$. Assume that $\frac{D(n,\mathcal{F})}{n}$ goes to 0 as n goes to infinity, and that $\mathrm{disc}(n, \mathcal{F}) \leq f(n)$ for a function f that satisfies $f(2n) \leq (2-\delta)f(n)$ for all n and some fixed $\delta > 0$. Then there exists a constant C_δ that only depends on δ, for which $D(n, \mathcal{F}) \leq C_\delta f(n)$.*

Lemma 3 and Theorem 2 imply that $D(n, \mathcal{T}_B) = O_{d,B}(\log^{d-1/2} n)$ for any convex polytope B in $\mathbb{R}^d$. This bound gets within an $O_{d,B}(\sqrt{\log n})$ factor from the best bound known for boxes in d dimensions. See the remarks after Section 4.6. of [Ms10] for references to prior work on bounding $D(n, \mathcal{T}_B)$ for a convex polytope B.

2 Preliminaries

In what follows we use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We use capital letters to denote matrices, and lower case letters with indexes to denote matrix entries, e.g. a_{ij} to denote the entry in row i column j of the matrix A. We also use μ_n for the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

2.1 The γ_2 factorization norm

The γ_2 norm was introduced in functional analysis to study operators that factor through Hilbert space. We say that an operator $u\colon X \to Y$ between Banach spaces X and Y factors through a Hilbert space if there exists a Hilbert space H and bounded operators $u_1\colon X \to H$ and $u_2\colon H \to Y$ such that $u = u_2 u_1$. Then the γ_2 norm of u is

$$\gamma_2(u) := \inf \|u_1\|\|u_2\|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all Hilbert spaces H, and all operators u_1 and u_2 as above. Here $\|u_1\|$ and $\|u_2\|$ are the operator norms of u_1 and u_2, respectively. The book of Tomczak-Jaegermann [TJ89] is an excellent reference on factorization norms and their applications in Banach space theory.

In this work we will use the γ_2 norm of an $m \times n$ matrix A, which is defined as the γ_2 norm of the linear operator $u\colon \ell_1^n \to \ell_\infty^m$ with matrix A (in the standard bases of $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$). In the language of matrices, this means that

$$\gamma_2(A) := \inf\{\|U\|_{2\to\infty}\|V\|_{1\to 2} : A = UV\},$$

where the infimum is taken over matrices U and V, $\|V\|_{1\to 2}$ equals the largest ℓ_2 norm of a column of V, and $\|U\|_{2\to\infty}$ equals the largest ℓ_2 norm of a row of U. By a standard compactness argument, the infimum is achieved; moreover, we can take $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times n}$, where r is the rank of A. Yet another equivalent formulation, which will be convenient for us, is that $\gamma_2(A)$ is the smallest non-negative real t for which there exist vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_m, v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^r$ such that for any $i \in [m], j \in [n]$, $a_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j \rangle$ and $\|u_i\|_2 \le t$, $\|v_j\|_2 \le 1$.

Let us further overload the meaning of γ_2 by defining $\gamma_2(\mathcal{F}) = \gamma_2(A)$ for a set system $\mathcal{F}$ with incidence matrix A. We recall that the incidence matrix of a system $\mathcal{F} = F_1, \ldots, F_m$ of subsets of a set $P = p_1, \ldots, p_n$ is defined as

$$a_{ij} := \begin{cases} 1 & p_j \in F_i \\ 0 & p_j \notin F_i \end{cases}.$$

In other worse, $\gamma_2(\mathcal{F})$ is the smallest non-negative real t such that there exist vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_m, v_1, \ldots, v_n$ satisfying

$$\langle u_i, v_j \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & p_j \in F_i \\ 0 & p_j \notin F_i \end{cases},$$

and $\|u_i\|_2 \leq t$, $\|v_j\|_2 \leq 1$ for all $i \in [m], j \in [n]$.

In [MN15] it was shown that $\gamma_2(\mathcal{F})$ is, up to logarithmic factors, equivalent to a hereditary version of combinatorial discrepancy. We do not directly use this connection here. In [MN15] it was also shown that γ_2 satisfies a number of nice properties which help in estimating the norm of specific matrices or set systems. Here we only need the following inequality, which holds for a set system $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \ldots \mathcal{F}_k$, where $\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_k$ are set systems over the same set P:

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{F}) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_2(\mathcal{F}_i)^2}. \tag{1}$$

We also need the following simple lemma, which follows, e.g. from the results in [MN15, MNT14], but also appears in a similar form in [Lar14], and follows from standard dyadic decomposition techniques.

Lemma 4. *For any $d \geq 1$ there exists a constant C_d such that the following holds. For any n-point set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_d(P)) \leq C_d(1 + \log n)^d$.*

2.2 Signed Series of Vectors

We will use the following result of Banaszczyk:

Lemma 5 ([Ban12])**.** *Let $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\forall i : \|v_i\|_2 \leq 1$, and let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be a convex body symmetric around the origin. If $\mu_m(K) \geq 1 - 1/(2n)$, then there exists an assignment of signs $\chi \colon [n] \to \{-1, 1\}$ so that*

$$\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : \sum_{i=1}^{j} \chi(i) v_i \in 5K.$$

This lemma was proved in the context of the well-known Steinitz problem: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, each of Euclidean norm at most 1, such that $v_1 + \ldots + v_n = 0$, find a permutation π on $[n]$ such that for all integers i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\|v_{\pi(1)} + \ldots + v_{\pi(i)}\|_2 \leq C\sqrt{m}$, where C is an absolute constant independent of m or n. Lemma 5 gives the best partial result in this direction: it can be used to show a bound of $C(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{\log n})$ in place of $C\sqrt{m}$.

Lemma 5 follows relatively easily from another powerful result Banaszczyk proved in [Ban98]. Unfortunately, the proof of the latter does not suggest any efficient algorithm to find the signs $\chi(i)$, and no such algorithm is yet known.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1. Let us fix the n-point set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ once and for all. Without loss of generality, assume that each $p \in P$ has a distinct last coordinate, and order the points in P in increasing order of their last coordinate as $p_1, \ldots, p_n$. Write each p_i as $p_i = (q_i, r_i)$, where $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$. With this notation, and the ordering we assumed, we have that $r_i < r_j$ whenever $i < j$.

Let $Q := \{q_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Notice that this is an n-point set in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Denote the sets in $\mathcal{A}_{d-1}(Q)$ as $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ (in no particular order). By Lemma 4, there exist vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_m$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ such that

$$\langle u_i, v_j \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & q_j \in A_i \\ 0 & q_j \notin A_i \end{cases}, \tag{2}$$

and $\|u_i\|_2 \leq C_d(1 + \log n)^{(d-1)}$, $\|v_j\|_2 \leq 1$ for all i and j. Define the symmetric polytope

$$K := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : |\langle u_i, x \rangle| \leq C'_d(1 + \log n)^{d-1/2} \ \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\},$$

where $C'_d > C_d$ is a constant large enough that $\mu_m(K) \geq 1 - 1/(2n)$. The fact that such a constant exists follows from standard concentration of measure results in Gaussian space. Indeed, using a Bernstein-type inequality for Gaussian measure, we can show that, for C'_d big enough, $\mu_m(S_i) \geq 1 - 1/(2n^{d+1})$ for all $i \in [m]$, where $S_i := \{x : |\langle u_i, x \rangle| \leq C'_d(1 + \log n)^{d-1/2})\}$. By the union bound, since $m \leq n^d$, this implies $\mu_m(\bigcap_{i=1}^m S_i) \geq 1 - 1/2n$.

The body K and the vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ then satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 5, and, therefore, there exists and assignment of signs $\chi \colon [n] \to \{-1, 1\}$ such that, for any k, $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi(j) v_j \in 5K.$$

Expanding the definition of K, we see this is equivalent to

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} : \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi(j) \langle u_i, v_j \rangle \right| \leq 5C'_d(1 + \log n)^{d-1/2}. \tag{3}$$

For each i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, let us define $A'_i = \{p_j : q_j \in A_i\}$. We claim that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can write $A(x) \cap P$ as $A'_i \cap \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ for some i and k. (Here we assume that $A(x) \cap P$ is non-empty: the other case is irrelevant to the proof.) To see this, let $x = (y, x_d)$, where $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $x_d \in \mathbb{R}$. Let i be such that $A(y) \cap Q = A_i$, and let k be the largest integer such that $r_k \leq x_d$. Then:

$$A(x) \cap P = \{p_j : q_j \in A(y), j \leq k\} = A'_i \cap \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}.$$

It follows that

$$\left|\sum_{j:p_j\in A(x)}\chi(j)\right| = \left|\sum_{j:q_j\in A_i, j\le k}\chi(j)\right| = \left|\sum_{j\le k}\chi(j)\langle u_i, v_j\rangle\right| \le 5C'_d(1+\log n)^{d-1/2},$$

where the penultimate equality follows from (2), and the final inequality is (3). Since x was arbitrary, we have shown that $\operatorname{disc}\mathcal{A}_d(P) \le 5C'_d(1+\log n)^{d-1/2}$, as was required.

4 Proof of Theorem 2

The main ingredient in extending Theorem 1 to arbitrary polytopes is a geometric decomposition due to Matoušek. To describe the decomposition we define the k-composition $Q_k(\mathcal{F})$ of sets from a (finite) set system $\mathcal{F}$ as follows. For $k=0$, $Q_k(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$; for an integer $k>0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_k(\mathcal{F}) :=& \{F_1\cup F_2 : F_1\in Q_{k_1}(\mathcal{F}), F_2\in Q_{k_2}(\mathcal{F}), F_1\cap F_2=\emptyset, k_1+k_2=k\}\cup \\ & \{F_1\setminus F_2 : F_1\in Q_{k_1}(\mathcal{F}), F_2\in Q_{k_2}(\mathcal{F}), F_2\subseteq F_1, k_1+k_2=k\}. \end{aligned}$$

By an easy induction on k, we see that

$$\operatorname{disc} Q_k(\mathcal{F}) \le k\operatorname{disc}\mathcal{F}. \tag{4}$$

We also extend the notion of anchored boxes to "corners" whose bounding hyperplanes are not necessarily orthogonal. Let $W=\{w_1,\dots,w_d\}$ be a basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then we define $\mathcal{A}_W := \{A_W(x) : x\in\mathbb{R}^d\}$, where $A_W(x) = \{y\in\mathbb{R}^d : \langle w_i, y\rangle \le \langle w_i, x\rangle\ \forall i\in[d]\}$.

The following lemma gives the decomposition result we need.

Lemma 6 ([Mat99])**.** *Let $B\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex polytope. There exists a constant k depending on d and B, and k bases $W_1,\dots,W_k$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that every $B'\in\mathcal{T}_B$ belongs to $Q_k(\mathcal{A}_{W_1}\cup\ldots\cup\mathcal{A}_{W_k})$. Moreover, $e_1\in W_1\cap W_2\cap\ldots\cap W_k$, where e_1 is the first standard basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Matoušek does not state the condition after "moreover"; nevertheless, it is easy to verify this condition holds for the recursive decomposition in his proof of Lemma 6.

We will also need a bound on $\gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_W(P))$ for a basis W and an n-point set P.

Lemma 7. *For any $d\ge 1$ there exists a constant C_d such that the following holds. For any basis W of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and any n-point set P, $\gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_W(P)) \le C_d(1+\log n)^d$.*

Proof. Let $W=w_1,\dots,w_d$, and let u be the linear map that sends the i-th standard basis vector e_i to w_i for each $i\in[d]$. Let $Q = u(P) := \{u^*(p) : p\in P\}$,

where u^* is the adjoint of u. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{A}_W(P) = \mathcal{A}_d(Q)$, and, therefore,

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_W(P)) = \gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_d(Q)) \leq C_d(1+\log n)^d,$$

where the final inequality follows from Lemma 4. □

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 2. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we fix the n-point set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ once and for all, and we order P as $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ in increasing order of the last coordinate. We write each p_i as $p_i = (q_i, r_i)$ for $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and define $Q := \{q_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Let $W_1, \ldots, W_k$ be as in Lemma 6, and let $W_i' = W_i \setminus \{e_1\}$ for each i, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Observe that W_i' is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. By (1) and Lemma 7,

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{A}_{W_1'}(Q) \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{A}_{W_k'}(Q)) \leq \sqrt{k} C_d (1+\log n)^{d-1}.$$

By an argument using Lemma 5 analogous to the one used in the proof of Theorem 1, we can then show that there exists a constant $C'_{B,d}$ depending on B and d and a coloring $\chi\colon [n] \to \{-1, 1\}$, such that for any integer i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\left| \sum_{j : p_j \in A_{W_i}(x)} \chi(j) \right| \leq C'_{B,d}(1+\log n)^{d-1/2}.$$

Here $C'_{B,d}$ is implicitly assumed to depend on k as well, which depends on B and d. This establishes that $\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{F} \leq C'_{B,d}(1+\log n)^{d-1/2}$, where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}_{W_1}(P) \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{A}_{W_k}(P)$. Because, by Lemma 6, $\mathcal{T}_B(P) \subset C_k(\mathcal{F})$, (4) implies

$$\operatorname{disc} \mathcal{T}_B(P) \leq \operatorname{disc} C_k(\mathcal{F}) \leq k \operatorname{disc} \mathcal{F} \leq k C'_{B,d}(1+\log n)^{d-1/2}.$$

This finishes the proof of the theorem. The same asymptotic bound with $\mathcal{T}_B$ replaced by $\mathrm{POL}(\mathcal{H})$ for a family of hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}$ can be proved by replacing Lemma 6 with an analogous decomposition lemma for $\mathrm{POL}(\mathcal{H})$, also proved in [Mat99].

References

[Ban98] W. Banaszczyk. Balancing vectors and Gaussian measures of n-dimensional convex bodies. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 12(4):351–360, 1998.

[Ban12] Wojciech Banaszczyk. On series of signed vectors and their rearrangements. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 40(3):301–316, 2012.

[BC08] József Beck and William W. L. Chen. *Irregularities of distribution*, volume 89 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008. Reprint of the 1987 original [MR0903025].

[Bec81] J. Beck. Balanced two-colorings of finite sets in the square. I. *Combinatorica*, 1:327–335, 1981.

[BG16] Nikhil Bansal and Shashwat Garg. Algorithmic discrepancy beyond partial coloring. *CoRR*, abs/1611.01805, 2016.

[BLV08] Dmitriy Bilyk, Michael T. Lacey, and Armen Vagharshakyan. On the small ball inequality in all dimensions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 254(9):2470–2502, 2008.

[Cha00] Bernard Chazelle. *The discrepancy method*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Randomness and complexity.

[Hal60] J. H. Halton. On the efficiency of certain quasi-random sequences of points in evaluating multi-dimensional integrals. *Numer. Math.*, 2:84–90, 1960.

[Ham60] J. M. Hammersley. Monte Carlo methods for solving multivariable problems. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 86:844–874 (1960), 1960.

[Lar14] K. G. Larsen. On range searching in the group model and combinatorial discrepancy. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):673–686, 2014.

[Mat99] Jirí Matoušek. On the discrepancy for boxes and polytopes. *Monatsh. Math.*, 127(4):325–336, 1999.

[MN15] Jirí Matousek and Aleksandar Nikolov. Combinatorial discrepancy for boxes via the gamma_2 norm. In Lars Arge and János Pach, editors, *31st International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2015, June 22-25, 2015, Eindhoven, The Netherlands*, volume 34 of *LIPIcs*, pages 1–15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015.

[MNT14] Jiří Matoušek, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Kunal Talwar. Factorization norms and hereditary discrepancy. *CoRR*, abs/1408.1376v2, 2014.

[Ms10] Ji˘ ríMatou˘ sek. *Geometric discrepancy*, volume 18 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. An illustrated guide, Revised paperback reprint of the 1999 original.

[Nik14] Aleksandar Nikolov. *New Computational Aspects of Discrepancy Theory*. PhD thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2014.

[NT15] Aleksandar Nikolov and Kunal Talwar. Approximating hereditary discrepancy via small width ellipsoids. In Piotr Indyk, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 324–336. SIAM, 2015.

[Rot54] K. F. Roth. On irregularities of distribution. *Mathematika*, 1:73–79, 1954.

[Sch72] Wolfgang M. Schmidt. Irregularities of distribution. VII. *Acta Arith.*, 21:45–50, 1972.

[TJ89] N. Tomczak-Jaegermann. *Banach-Mazur Distances and Finite-Dimensional Operator Ideals*. Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics 38. J. Wiley, New York, 1989.